
From: Astrid.M.Liverman@hawaii.gov
To: Spurgeon, Lawrence
Sent: 5/16/2008 11:01:35 AM
Subject: Re: Follow-up on voicemail

Dear Lawrence:

To follow up, I just checked into the nomination files for OR&L and Dillingham Transportation Buildings, both of which indicate that the boundaries set were the TMK. I hope that information is useful to you. Please let me know if there are any other specific files that I can clarify for you. In the interim, I will look forward to our meeting and continuing discussions.

Have a great weekend!

Best,

Astrid

Astrid M. B. Liverman, Ph.D.
Architecture Branch Chief
State Historic Preservation Division
Department of Land and Natural Resources

Kakuhihewa Building
601 Kamokila Blvd., Suite 555
Kapolei, Hawai'i 96707
Ph: (808) 692-8015
(808) 692-8028 (direct)
Fax: (808) 692-8020

"Spurgeon, Lawrence" <Spurgeon@pbworld.com>

05/14/2008 01:42 PM

To <Astrid.M.Liverman@hawaii.gov>

cc "Faith Miyamoto (Honolulu DTS) (fmiyamoto@co.honolulu.hi.us)"
<fmiyamoto@honolulu.gov>, "Ann Yoklavich" <ay@masonarch.com>, "Foell, Stephanie"
<Foell@pbworld.com>, <robbins@infraconsultllc.com>, "Dee Ruzicka"
<dr@masonarch.com>

Subject Follow-up on voicemail

Astrid,
As I mentioned in my voicemail, we had a conference call with FTA a few days ago and were updating them on our Section 106 coordination and the context within Section 4(f) of the DOT act.

The conversation raised a couple of questions.

First - establishing the boundary of individual historic resources. We were looking at the OR&L building on King St. The tax lot for the site is quite large, including the building, parking lot, surrounding landscaping, and the large storage lot used by the LOST production company that is gravel, fenced and unrelated to the historic context. Our FTA reviewer was of the opinion that the boundary of the resource should not extend beyond the edge of the parking/landscape area around the station, and not into the non-contextual vacant/storage area around it. This was the most obvious example, but individual buildings on military property (several hundred acres in one tax-lot) are also a similar situation. We understand that in some cases including a property to its current legal (parcel) boundaries makes sense, but other instances, including acreage that no longer conveys the historic purpose

AR00145058

of the eligible built resource does not seem to be defensible.

Second - Historic Districts. This is an area that has substantial effect on how we address Section 4(f) for the project overall. We have been discussing internally that we understand the desire to capture the change to setting as an adverse effect to individual resources, but are having trouble making the jump to the project causing adverse effect to the district as a whole under Section 106 (to where the effect jeopardizes the integrity of the district to the point that character-defining features are altered and the district would no longer be considered eligible for listing in the National Register).

Thank you for your consideration, please call or e-mail when you have the opportunity.
Lawrence

Lawrence Spurgeon
Parsons Brinckerhoff
(808) 768-6147
spurgeon@pbworld.com

NOTICE: This communication and any attachments ("this message") may contain confidential information for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). Any unauthorized use, disclosure, viewing, copying, alteration, dissemination or distribution of, or reliance on this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, or you are not an authorized recipient, please notify the sender immediately by replying to this message, delete this message and all copies from your e-mail system and destroy any printed copies.